

Date: Wed, 21 Apr 93 17:51:43 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #111
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 21 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 111

Today's Topics:

10meters (Give it to CB)
1500 watts too much?
ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
CW = effective utilization? (2 msgs)
Just waiting the OFs out
My thoughts...
OO != Slow (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 20 Apr 93 21:34:00 GMT
From: gummy!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!jim.garver@yale.arpa
Subject: 10meters (Give it to CB)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: zardoz@ornews.intel.com (Jim Garver)
Date: 19 Apr 1993 12:09:01 -0700
Organization: Intel Corporation, Oregon
Message-ID: <1qutcd\$77f@ornews.intel.com>

In article <1993Apr16.223346.5508@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com> billn@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com (b
>bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:

>: stated this intent. That is great, but I think we all would like to see som
>: spectrum remain focused on experimentation, public service, etc. I would
>: rather the new citizen bands be new allocations, but would settle for 10m,
>: etc. being reallocated to CB.

>
>Why 10m? You would just have the same problems that occur on the current
>11m band. It should be put up around 700Mhz - where skip is not a real
>problem. After all, CB is supposedly for local communication.

>
700 Mhz would provide some truly awful point-to-point propagation
so I suppose some folks, particularly hams, would feel the unwashed
masses inhabiting the current CB allocations would be served their
due justice.

Somewhere I read that the frequencies between 25-30 Mhz were best for
maximum ground wave propagation due to most bending of waves versus
least atmospheric disturbance. The maximum reasonable size for a
mobile 1/4 wave whip may also have something to do with it. I don't
believe the effects of periodic skip conditions on 10-11 meters were
properly understood or accounted for when the band was reallocated
to CB class D.

Its pretty obvious to me that more spectrum is needed for those not
knowledgeable about blue LEDs and such. I guess more UHF TV channels
could be stolen as the cellular boys did but propagation would suffer.
In any case hams should be more supportive of CB needs and less
critical of their operations. Otherwise 10 meters may become a
defacto CB band if it hasn't in some places already.

WA7LDV

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway	Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins	
FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups!	PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail	
Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959	+-----+	
Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988		

Date: 20 Apr 93 22:23:00 GMT
From: gumby!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!george.noyes.x5698@yale.arpa
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: georgen@stortek.com (George Noyes x5698)
Message-ID: <1993Apr19.232812.9048@stortek.com>
Organization: Storage Technology
Date: Mon, 19 Apr 1993 23:28:12 GMT

In article <11947@prijat.cs.uofs.edu> bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshanno
>guy next door with 1000 watts. I would personally like to see the limit set a
>about 500 watts max. I do not believe any other country (except maybe Canada)

>repeater owner inherently has a better sense of what is good operating
>practice than the repeater user. This model doesn't hold up in a modern
>digital network.
>

To which Ed Naratil (ean@VFL.Paramax.COM) replied:

This would seem to take into account the originator of the message claiming that someone else pirated his call (as in the infamous 900 message that started the whole thing).

Although the call of the first forwarding station or BBS could also be faked, it is harder to do than just changing "MYCALL" in your TNC.

As we all know, there are idiots in every organization (including internet users) and they will on occasion use someone elses, or make up calls.

And I say:

But this shows a fundamental problem with getting the message over that this is a bad rule: most folks think of packet radio as being connected to a PBBS, but TCP/IP isn't like this at all.

You compose your mail (for example) on your PC. Then you pass it onto the mailer which will give it to sendmail to actually mail it off on the first hop of its journey.

The mailer then sends packets of your message to the station that will further route it to its destination as packets. These routed packets are just blocks of data that pass through the routing software, the sysop of that station doesn't normally look at packets going through the router (unless your trying to fix a bug in the router!) and so to its destination.

To further complicate matters the packets don't have to all pass through a given single router. Imagine the router goes down during the transmission then the routing software will choose the next best route and send packets to that machine. This might also be the case on mediocre or overloaded links (depends on the routing protocol used).

In this case who is the first forwarding station? The station who retransmits the first packet (the first packet sent or the first one retransmitted?) or the one who retransmits the offensive packet (one with 1-900-555-1212 or even F-U-C- K to defeat possible "obscenity filters"). What happens if the "offensive information" is split over two packets?

What happens if you transmit a binary file over the air which contains the ASCII characters 'f', 'u', 'c' and 'k' in that order? what happens to the forwarder?

Of course none of this has apparently been thought about. Do everybody a favour tell the FCC (and ARRL) of your disapproval. Otherwise this rule is seriously going to restrict the use of innovative digital systems in amateur radio.

Make the person who sends the initial message responsible for its contents (but what if it gets changed en-route? digital signatures?).

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP

a-kevinp@microsoft.com

"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

```
| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959      +-----+
| Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988 |
```

Date: 20 Apr 93 22:24:00 GMT

From: gumby!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!kevin.purcell@network.ucsd.edu,

Subject: CW = effective utilization?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: a-kevinp@microsoft.COM (Kevin Purcell, Rho)

Date: 20 Apr 93 01:27:38 GMT

Organization: UCSD Usenet Gateway

Message-ID: <9304200226.AB04700@netmail.microsoft.com>

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX said:

Given the limited capacity of the bands, and how close to capacity the SSB portion is already, it only makes sense to encourage a mode that takes up 100 Hz instead of 2400...

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."

->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

OK then. Make them whistle 85Hz shift 45 baud RTTY (yea, that's a

little wider than 100HZ but then its close to 45 wpm morse. Perhaps we can make a non-standard 5 baud, 13 baud and 20 baud versions.

Yeah, that's the ticket ...

Paul you should stop these bogus "CW is the most effecient mode in 100Hz". We all know that if you slow down an FSK signal and use ARQ we would have a digital mode with machines on both ends being more reliable and having a higher throughput than human driven CW.

CW is a fun mode to use, but isn't the ne plus ultra of amateur radio, and isn't the sine qua non of amateur radio, either, though some believe this to be true.

How about we do the amateur exams in Latin. That would keep all those young CBer types off the bands ...

Yeah, that's the ticket ...

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP

a-kevinp@microsoft.com

"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

```
| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959      +-----+
| Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988 |
```

Date: 20 Apr 93 22:24:00 GMT

From: gumbly!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!dana.h..myers@yale.arpa

Subject: CW = effective utilization?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers)

Message-ID: <1993Apr19.220357.165205@locus.com>

Organization: Locus Computing Corporation, Los Angeles, California

Date: Mon, 19 Apr 93 22:03:57 GMT

In article <1993Apr19.154848.19613@ve6mgs.ampr.org> mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark
>

>>As someone else so eloquently put it, "Quit whinning and just learn the
>>code".

>This is true, if you hit the 10wpm barrier, you will be pissed tho' You

>should have learned it as 'sounds' and ignored the chart ... (just give
>the sounds a name, you can fix it up later). Farnsworth is the best
>way of getting to 13wpm (fast, with oodles of intercharacter space).
>
>Ciao -- Mark

Yeah. All the people that say "Quit whining and just learn the code"
and those who agree with it, I challenge you to just start standing on
your head. Afterall, some people enjoy standing on their head and they
develop a better sense of balance. Who knows, standing on your head may
save your life. It doesn't matter that standing on your head is
of little practical advantage anymore and that you can get gravity
boots to hang upside down.

Awww... stop yer complaining and just stand on your head. After an
hour or two you'll get the hang of it. It is relaxing and you'll
be one with the brotherhood of other people who stand on their
heads.

If you use your elbows you'll be pissed cause they'll get tired and
you'll be sorry you just didn't learn to control your neck muscles
better....

--
* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959 +-----+
| Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988 |

Date: 20 Apr 93 23:26:00 GMT
From: gumby!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!luck.hurder.ky1t@yale.arpa
Subject: Just waiting the OFs out
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: lhurder@arrl.org (Luck Hurder KY1T)
Message-ID: <1394@arrl.org>

Date: 20 Apr 93 08:22:16 EDT
Organization: American Radio Relay League

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>
>...The IARU is a creature of the ARRL, ...

Really! I'll have to relate that to the IARU; they'll be SOME surprised...

```
|      |      |      Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.  
|      |_____|      The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL  
| uck   |_____|urder  National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to  
-----|      |      the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL  
KY1T      Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.
```

lhurder@arrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"
Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959 | +-----+
| Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988 |

Date: 20 Apr 93 23:26:00 GMT
From: gummy!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!justin.fanning@yale.arpa
Subject: My thoughts...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: justin@stock.apana.org.au (Justin Fanning)
Message-ID: <Ny6a3B1w165w@stock.apana.org.au>
Date: Tue, 20 Apr 93 14:57:34 +1000
Organization: Buy... Sell... (Stock Data, Melbourne)

bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:

> In article <1qh5rfINNb4f@mojo.eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris -
> >In article <1993Apr13.184121.16519@btree.uucp> bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) wr
> >>I think that we should reallocate a big chunk of 10m to CB. And give them

> >>some VHF/UHF also. After all, the "waves" belong to the citizens.

More spectrum I agree with, but not the 10M band, propagation is to good.

> Well, according the "Purpose of Amateur Radio" as codified in part 97, the ha
> bands are not "citizen's bands". The amateur allocation's scope and purpose

That is what it says on paper, but take your scanner and listen to your local 2M repeater, and you will see 2M is just like cb, but on a higher level. (very little technical conversation, mostly chit chat.)

As for packet, that is an even bigger fraud of spectrum, their is no "Experimentation" going on, just users taking advantage of the available spectrum to setup their own personal or club packet bbs systems. The computers are BOUGHT, the transmitters are BOUGHT, the antenna is BOUGHT and the software is BOUGHT (or copyed) WHERE IS THE EXPERIMENTATION!

> Citizen's bands should be large radio parklands of spectrum set aside for
> general citizens to use without any content restrictions. This spectrum
> should serve for personal communications, personal business, and low-level
> broadcasting. Most importantly, this "parkland" should be available to

I'm not sure about 'Low level broadcasting', perhaps a section of your proposed band could be set aside for that, as for personal & buisness, they would need seperate area's as well. (In Australia we have a 40 Ch. UHF CB service as well as HF 27 Mhz) and the private users are always telling the buisness users 'Where to go'. But I still agree with your initial principal.

> These proposed citizen's bands would not be anything like the 11m band we
> have today. It can be easily argued that the problems with that band have

How can you say that? Congestion is only 1 of a number of problems 11M faces todays.

This conversation reminds me of an artical I saw a few years back, (can't remember where) stating that the spectrum costs nothing to provide, nothing to maintain (not policing, the other type), and it never wears out. So why do governments use it as such a money making tool? To buy 12.5Khz of spectrum in a built up city, can cost over A\$1M, who should I make the cheque out to "GOD" ?

Justin

- Who: Justin Fanning | Where: Victoria, AUSTRALIA -
- How: justin@stock.apana.org.au | Voice: +61 3 879-3474 -

- Give your life to JESUS, or spend eternity in HELL -

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959 +-----+
Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988

Date: 20 Apr 93 22:25:00 GMT
From: gumby!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!bruce.walzer@yale.arpa
Subject: 00 != Slow
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: bwalzer@muug.mb.ca (Bruce Walzer)
Message-ID: <1993Apr20.032014.15545@muug.mb.ca>
Organization: Manitoba Unix User Group, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1993 03:20:14 GMT

In <1993Apr19.231621.12745@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Pau
. . .

>The simple truth of the matter is that amateur HF spectrum is a limited
>resource, and that we currently ration it according to a licensee's
>willingness to learn a more spectrally efficient manual transmission method.
>Given the nature of the limited resource, it only makes sense to ration the
>resource based on a rationee's proven capability to use that resource most
>efficiently.

>Unless you also propose some replacement system of rationing, you're being
>intellectually dishonest.

Neat! Ok, 20 WPM works out to something like 20 baud with 10 bit characters.
With FSK it wouldn't be too hard to fit that into something like 80 Hz. You'd
use a DSP to demodulate. Just let the no-codes operate below 30 MHz with the
restriction that they could not occupy more than lets say 100 Hz (they might
want to add some error correction overhead and still get that "CW" thruput).
Or maybe allow spread spectrum with a resultant data rate not to exceed 20
baud.

The only disadvantage to something like my proposal is that one might start
to see people complaining about all that spectrally inefficient code
cluttering up the bands.

Bruce Walzer |Voice: (204)783-4983
1312 Valour Rd. |Internet: bwalzer@mona.muug.mb.ca
Winnipeg MB |BBS: (204)783-3617 (Ariel II, 1200,8,N)
R3E 2W8 |AmRadio: VE4XOR
Canada |

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959 +-----+
| Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988 |

Date: 20 Apr 93 22:21:00 GMT
From: gumby!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!paul.flaherty@yale.arpa
Subject: 00 != Slow
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty)
Message-ID: <1993Apr19.231621.12745@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Organization: The Three Packeteers
Date: Mon, 19 Apr 93 23:16:21 GMT

In article <1993Apr19.174801.27371@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.c
>Ah, now we've really gotten to the heart of the matter. It's called
>"keeping people out". That's sounds like the underlying principle to me.

No, it's mandating the acquisition of a skill which leads to more efficient
use of the spectrum. Sorry to disappoint you, but that's clearly *not*
keeping people out for the sake of keeping people out, your ad hom aside.

>Another great generalization, and like its predecessors in this thread,
>also wrong.

The claimed benefits from OOPS lie on code maintenance and reuse, *not* in
performance. Sorry, but unless you're willing to balkanize Shannon's law,
you can't abstract without losing performance. But this is a digression.

>If movement to the CW portions of the band is the solution, what makes you
>think requiring it as a licensing requirement will motivate amateurs to
>move off of the SSB segments any more than CW's "spectral efficiency",
>lower utilization of its segments, and its ability to cut through the QRM
>will get them to move?

I don't have to show that it does motivate; I'm not advocating the change. What *you* need to demonstrate is that SSB use will *not* increase as a result of that change.

It's easy to show that this is not the case. There is plenty of empirical evidence to show that about half of all ham QSOs currently use CW, and about half use SSB on HF (the other digital modes are in the noise at about 10%). Moreover, the number of licensed amateurs in the US who are not allowed to use HF SSB is about double those so privileged.

Now, if what you say is true, that forcing someone to learn CW is wasted effort, then if you drop that restriction, people will *not* learn it. To claim otherwise is a contradiction.

The net result is an immediate tripling of the HF SSB band load. That doesn't include the additional loading as CW dies out. Given that the HF bands are already at capacity on the weekends, the result is empirically demonstrated by behavior on the 2m band in any major metropolitan area, which, incidentally, accounts for the majority of FCC enforcement actions. Again, balkanizing Shannon's law is not an option.

The simple truth of the matter is that amateur HF spectrum is a limited resource, and that we currently ration it according to a licensee's willingness to learn a more spectrally efficient manual transmission method. Given the nature of the limited resource, it only makes sense to ration the resource based on a rationee's proven capability to use that resource most efficiently.

Unless you also propose some replacement system of rationing, you're being intellectually dishonest.

. What a crock. Let's bring back smoke signals,
>there's lots of under utilized air in the country. ;-)

Obviously, however, there's no shortage of hot air...

```
--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU   | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)
---
. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

----
| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
```

| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959 +-----+
| Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988 |

Date: 20 Apr 93 22:23:00 GMT
From: gumby!destroyer!iunet!hal9k!george.noyes.x5698@yale.arp
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <-LVV5J0XZ@linac.fnal.gov>, <RFM.93Apr14232311@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<2roy
Reply-To : george.noyes.x5698@hal9k.ann-arbor.mi.us (George Noyes X5698)
Subject : Re: EME absolutely needs 1500 watts? (was Re: 1500 watts too much?)

From: georgen@stortek.com (George Noyes x5698)
Message-ID: <1993Apr19.233335.9157@stortek.com>
Organization: Storage Technology
Date: Mon, 19 Apr 1993 23:33:35 GMT

In article <25144@ksr.com> jfw@ksr.com (John F. Woods) writes:
>rfr@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:
>>In article <-LVV5J0XZ@linac.fnal.gov> carlson@linac.fnal.gov (Kermit Carlson)
>> You of course are telling me that my running 1.5K for EME is wrong...
>
>A few months ago, there was an article in QEX (I think) about someone running
>a "QRP" EME station, with a mere 100W. Of course, he had an antenna array tha
>more than made up for the "low" power.

I agree that 100w is "possible" but until you try it, then you'll find
out why the "possible" is in quotes! You really neeeeeeed as much power
as you can muster with any kind of reasonable antenna! I think we should
lobby for a 2.5 KW limit for us Moon Bouncers!

de George, W1XE

. R110B:Wnet HAL_9000

| HAL 9000 BBS: QWK-to-Usenet gateway | Four 14400 v.32bis dial-ins |
| FREE Usenet mail and 200 newsgroups! | PCBoard 14.5aM * uuPCB * Kmail |
| Call +1 313 663 4173 or 663 3959 +-----+
| Member of EFF, ASP, ASAD * 1500MB disk * Serving Ann Arbor since 1988 |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #111
